

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in the case interview on July 26, 2007. During the case interview, the Examiner recommended that the claims be amended to clarify the invention. Applicants' representative requested that the Examiner issue a formal Office Action in which specific rejections were indicated.

Independent claims 1, 9, 13, and 14 have been amended. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 12-15 are pending.

Applicants have amended claim 9. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection on page 3 is respectfully requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 9, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to the claimed invention allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended the affected claims. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0035515 A1 (Moreno).

Moreno is directed to a system and process for securing goods delivered to and retrieved from a secure storage unit. According to Moreno, access to the interior of a locker (for example, a garage or mailbox) of the system is controlled by a server which is in communication with the locker via an Internet or other network connection. A server controls the accessing and operation of the locker in combination with a controller, which is located in a kiosk that provides user interfaces by which customers, vendors, and/or carriers access and utilize the locker.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, 9, 13, and 14 are patentable over Moreno, as Moreno fails to disclose, "further storing information for a deliverer corresponding to the delivery goods information in said storage unit and receiving the delivery goods identification information and reception approval /refusal information entered by said recipient," as recited in claim 1, for example.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the above-identified feature of the present invention is disclosed at paragraph [0067] of Moreno. Applicants respectfully submit that the information in Moreno's paragraph [0067] pertains to a system notification. That is, in Moreno, the system notifies a customer of a return date or other time constraint.

In contrast, in the present invention, the system receives "the delivery goods identification information and reception approval/refusal information entered by said recipient," as recited in

claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that in Moreno, unlike in the present invention, the customer does not enter delivery goods identification information and reception approval/refusal information. Rather Moreno merely discloses that a customer is notified of a pick-up time to retrieve the goods. See Moreno, paragraphs [0066] and [0067].

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 13-14 are patentable over Moreno. As dependent claims 4, 2, and 15 depend from their respective independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the reference for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

Regarding the last paragraph on page 8 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that for a method claim to be anticipated, each operation recited in the claim must be disclosed by a reference. Therefore, assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner is correct regarding Applicants' claims reciting alternative language, the claims recite other operations which must also be disclosed by the reference. For example, even if the operation of claim 1 identified by the language "further storing . . ." is disclosed by a reference, the receiving operation, the extraction operations, and the notifying operations must also be disclosed for anticipation to occur.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 2, 2008

By: 

Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501